A Bayesian quasi-probability approach to inferring the past of quantum observables

Mankei Tsang*
Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore, 4 Engineering Drive 3, Singapore 117583 and Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117551
(Dated: April 2, 2014)

I describe a method of inferring the past of quantum observables given the initial state and the subsequent measurement results using Wigner quasi-probability representations. The method is proved to be compatible with logic for large subclasses of quantum systems, including those that involve incompatible observables and can still exhibit some quantum features, such as the uncertainty relation, measurement backaction, and entanglement.

arXiv:1403.3353v2 [quant-ph] 1 Apr 2014

I. INTRODUCTION

Applying classical reasoning to quantum systems often leads to paradoxes. Many of the paradoxes involve inferring the past of a quantum observable given initial conditions and subsequent measurement outcomes, such as the path taken by a quantum particle in an interferometer [1–4]. The weak value proposed by Aharonov, Albert, and Vaidman (AAV) [5] has been widely used experimentally to provide such an inference [4, 6–11], but it often produces results that defy common sense; for example, a weak value can go well outside of the spectrum of an observable and even become complex.

It is often claimed that anomalous weak values are signatures of the non-classicality of a quantum system [4, 6, 7]. A recent work by Ferrie and Combes [12] shows, however, that an estimator analogous to the weak value can also produce non-sense when applied to a classical coin. If the weak value does not even make sense classically, should we expect it to be any more meaningful for quantum systems?

Here I describe an alternative method of inferring the past of a quantum system based on quasi-probability representations. The method was first proposed in Refs. [13, 14] and called quantum smoothing, but the focus there was the estimation of classical signals coupled to quantum systems and there was no general proof of its compatibility with logic. The main purpose of this paper is to prove that, through the celebrated Cox's theorem [15, 16] and Wigner functions [17], quantum smoothing is compatible with logic for large subclasses of quantum systems, including those that involve incompatible observables and can still exhibit some quantum features, such as the uncertainty relation, measurement backaction, and entanglement. This general proof is the key feature of the proposed method and a significant improvement over previous approaches [3, 4], the logicality of which is less obvious when incompatible observables are concerned. By applying quantum smoothing to a qubit and the AAV gedanken experiment, I also demonstrate how my method can avoid some of the counter-intuitive issues associated with the weak value.

* eletmk@nus.edu.sg

II. LOGICAL INFERENCE

A. Classical

Consider first the classical inference problem. Cox's theorem [15, 16] states that the only consistent method of assigning plausibilities to propositions is equivalent to the laws of probability, and the Bayes theorem in particular, if one assumes a set of desiderata that can be regarded as an extension of Aristotelian logic and summarized as follows [16]:

1. Representation of degrees of plausibility by real numbers.
2. Qualitative correspondence with common sense.
3. Consistency.

In the rest of the paper I shall take the view that Cox's desiderata and logic are equivalent notions. Readers who wish to challenge this definition of logic are urged to read Refs. [15, 16], and until they have come up with a better definition, Cox's theorem remains the most rigorous logical foundation available for statistical inference.

To be specific, consider the inference problem depicted in Fig. 1. Let x be a parameter that represents facts known at an initial time, y be another parameter that represents facts known at a final time, and λ be the hidden variable whose value at the intermediate time is to be inferred. Suppose that the predictive probability function $P_1(\lambda|x)$ and the retrodictive likelihood function $P_2(y|\lambda,x)$ are given. This is a reasonable assumption, as causality implies that λ should depend on x, y should depend on both λ and x, and noise should introduce uncertainties to the dependencies. The posterior probability function of λ conditioned on x and y is

$$P(\lambda|x,y) = \frac{P_2(y|\lambda,x)P_1(\lambda|x)}{\sum_\lambda P_2(y|\lambda,x)P_1(\lambda|x)}, \tag{2.1}$$

which is the logical assignment of plausibilities to values of λ given known facts x and y. For example, the most



FIG. 1. A flowchart depicting the inference problem. Solid arrows denote the direction of causality. The problem of statistical inference is to infer λ from x and y using the given $P_1(\lambda|x)$ and $P_2(y|\lambda,x)$.

likely λ can be determined from $P(\lambda|x,y)$ by finding the λ that maximizes the posterior and is called the maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) estimate. In accordance with the terminology in estimation theory [13, 14, 18], I refer to the inference of a hidden variable at the intermediate time as smoothing.

B. Quantum

I now ask how one can logically infer the past of a quantum system. Suppose that the initial quantum state given prior facts represented by x is ρ_x, and the positive operator-valued measure (POVM) for the measurement at the final time with outcome y is $E(y|x)$, which, for generality, can be adaptive and depend on x. Born's rule gives

$$P(y|x) = \operatorname{tr} E(y|x)\rho_x. \tag{2.2}$$

To infer logically the value of quantum observables, denoted by λ, at the intermediate time is to assign a non-negative posterior probability function to their possible values through the Bayes theorem. Define a pair of maps that transform ρ_x and $E(y|x)$ to quasi-probability functions of λ:

$$\mathcal{W}_1\rho_x = W_1(\lambda|x), \tag{2.3}$$
$$\mathcal{W}_2E(y|x) = W_2(y|\lambda,x), \tag{2.4}$$

and require that they obey Born's rule in the following way:

$$P(y|x) = \operatorname{tr} E(y|x)\rho_x = \sum_\lambda W_2(y|\lambda,x)W_1(\lambda|x). \tag{2.5}$$

If $W_2(y|\lambda,x)$ and $W_1(\lambda|x)$ are both non-negative, the posterior function given by

$$W(\lambda|x,y) = \frac{W_2(y|\lambda,x)W_1(\lambda|x)}{P(y|x)} \tag{2.6}$$

is also non-negative and compatible with the laws of probability and Cox's desiderata. Hence, the logicality of quantum smoothing and the non-negativity of quasi-probability representations are equivalent notions.

If $W_1(\lambda|x)$ and $W_2(y|\lambda,x)$ are restricted to be non-negative, it is known that no single pair of maps $\mathcal{W}_1$ and $\mathcal{W}_2$ can explain all predictions of quantum mechanics [19, 20]. This is known as contextuality; without this property, quantum mechanics would be equivalent to a classical hidden variable model. The key point here is that many large and important subclasses of quantum systems, such as the odd-dimensional stabilizer quantum computation model [21, 22] and the linear Gaussian model for canonical observables [23–25], turn out to be perfectly described by non-negative $W_1(\lambda|x)$ and $W_2(y|\lambda,x)$ if they are chosen to be the appropriate discrete or continuous Wigner representations of ρ_x and $E(y|x)$. These models generally involve incompatible observables and can still exhibit some quantum features, such as the uncertainty relation, measurement backaction, and entanglement.

To prove the logicality of quantum smoothing for the aforementioned subclasses explicitly, I write Born's rule in the following way:

$$P(y|x) = \operatorname{tr} E(y|x,t_j)\rho_x(t_j) \tag{2.7}$$

for any time $t_j, j = 0, 1, \ldots, J$, where

$$\rho_x(t_j) \equiv \mathcal{U}_x(t_j)\ldots\mathcal{U}_x(t_2)\mathcal{U}_x(t_1)\rho_x(t_0), \tag{2.8}$$
$$E(y|x,t_j) \equiv \mathcal{U}_x^*(t_{j+1})\ldots\mathcal{U}_x^*(t_{J-1})\mathcal{U}_x^*(t_J)E(y|x,t_J), \tag{2.9}$$

$\rho_x(t_0)$ is the initial density operator, $E(y|x,t_J)$ is the final POVM, and $\mathcal{U}_x(t_j)$ denotes a unitary operation with unitary operator $U_x(t_j)$:

$$\mathcal{U}_x(t_j)\rho \equiv U_x(t_j)\rho U_x^\dagger(t_j), \tag{2.10}$$
$$\mathcal{U}_x^*(t_j)E \equiv U_x^\dagger(t_j)EU_x(t_j). \tag{2.11}$$

The unitary operations can also model open-system evolution and sequential and adaptive measurements if the Hilbert space is suitably dilated [26, 27]. If I choose $\mathcal{W}_1$ to be a Wigner representation of $\rho_x(t_j)$:

$$W_1(\lambda,t_j|x) = \mathcal{W}_1\rho_x(t_j), \tag{2.12}$$

and $\mathcal{W}_2$ to be $\mathcal{W}_1$ multiplied by a normalization factor $\mathcal{N}$:

$$W_2(y|\lambda,x,t_j) = \mathcal{W}_2E(y|x,t_j) = \mathcal{N}\mathcal{W}_1E(y|x,t_j), \tag{2.13}$$

a fundamental property of the Wigner representation [19] can be used to give

$$\operatorname{tr} E(y|x,t_j)\rho_x(t_j) = \sum_\lambda W_2(y|\lambda,x,t_j)W_1(\lambda,t_j|x), \tag{2.14}$$

making the hidden-variable model consistent with Born's rule. For continuous variables, $\sum_\lambda$ should be replaced by an integral.

For quantum systems with odd dimensions, Gross [21, 22] showed that a pure state is a stabilizer state if and only if the natural analog of the Wigner representation for odd dimensions is non-negative. Restricting $\rho_x(t_0)$ to stabilizer states and $\mathcal{U}_x(t_j)$ to Clifford operations, which transform stabilizer states to stabilizer states, $W_1(\lambda, t_j|x)$ is non-negative at any time. If $E(y|x, t_J)$ is a stabilizer-state projection, $W_2(y|\lambda, x, t_j)$ is non-negative as well, since $\mathcal{U}_x^*$ is also a Clifford operation if $\mathcal{U}_x$ is one. Hence, the odd-dimensional stabilizer model, which consists of stabilizer states, Clifford operations, and stabilizer-state projections, can always be represented by non-negative W_1 and W_2 at any time t_j and permits logical smoothing inference.

Similarly, for canonical observables, such as the continuous positions and momenta of harmonic oscillators, it is well known that a state with a Gaussian Wigner representation remains Gaussian if the Hamiltonian is quadratic with respect to the canonical observables [23–25]. If $E(y|x, t_J)$ is a projective measurement with respect to the canonical observables, and the unitary operations are restricted to those with quadratic Hamiltonians, $W_2(y|\lambda, x, t_j)$ is also Gaussian. The linear Gaussian model, which consists of Gaussian states, quadratic Hamiltonians, and canonical-observable measurements, can therefore be represented by non-negative and Gaussian W_1 and W_2 at all times and also permits logical smoothing inference.

For quantum systems that do not admit non-negative quasi-probability representations, the smoothing inference necessarily violates Cox's desiderata and can lead to paradoxes. One example is shown in Ref. [14] for Hardy's paradox [28] using a discrete Wigner representation. It must be emphasized that negative quasi-probabilities do not resolve any paradox; they simply mean that the inference according to the hidden-variable model is illogical. For illustrative and pedagogical purposes it is still useful to report the quasi-probability functions for experiments, as they are more obvious indicators of non-classicality than density matrices and POVMs. For a more sensible estimate than the weak value, one can choose

$$\lambda_{x,y}^{\mathrm{MAP}} \equiv \arg\max_\lambda W(\lambda|x, y) \tag{2.15}$$

as the MAP quasi-estimate, which is still one of the possible values of λ and will never become anomalously large or complex, thus avoiding some of the counter-intuitive features of the weak value. In the case of Hardy's paradox, Ref. [14] shows that $\lambda_{x,y}^{\mathrm{MAP}}$ indeed reproduces the most likely paths suggested by classical reasoning, even though they still lead to logical contradictions.

C. Weak value as an estimate

In the weak-value approach, an additional weak measurement [26, 27, 29, 30] is made before the final measurement. To model that scenario, it is important not to confuse the weak measurement outcome with the hidden variable to be inferred. The weak measurement outcome can be grouped with either x or y, and the Bayesian protocol, if it exists, will give us a posterior distribution of λ for any number of trials. From the perspective of Cox's theorem, any method that deviates from the Bayesian approach is illogical [16], and if we view the weak value simply as an inference method that combines data in a special way to produce an estimate of the observable, it should not surprise us that it can produce non-sense, unless it happens to agree with the Bayesian approach. No amount of heuristic reasoning can save the weak value from illogicality otherwise.

In the context of the quasi-probability framework, one can ask whether the weak value corresponds to an estimate arising from a posterior quasi-probability function. The answer was provided by Johansen and Luis [31], who showed that the weak value is equivalent to the conditional average using what they called the S distributions, which can be negative or even complex. It is currently unknown under what situation the S distributions are non-negative, so the logical foundation of the weak value remains questionable.

D. Logical inference versus decision theory

Besides the logical interpretation, one can also justify Bayesian inference in a more utilitarian manner using decision theory [16, 32], which shows that Bayesian inference can minimize the expected error between an estimate and the true value of a hidden variable. In this paper, I do not attach any decision-theoretic significance to the quantum inference, as the past of a quantum observable is usually not available for error evaluation because of the no-cloning theorem. Any apparent illogicality that arises from negative quasi-probabilities exists only in the mind and can be attributed to the wrong model being used for a quantum system; the experimenter only has access to prior facts and measurement outcomes, which obey Born's rule and hence the laws of probability and logic.

This kind of mental exercise is not entirely philosophical however. The smoothing inference provides an alternative way of thinking about when a quantum system follows classical logic internally and is therefore simulable by a classical computer. This question is central not only to quantum computation and quantum simulation [33], but also to the implementation of quantum estimation and control algorithms [13, 14, 27, 34].

The method presented here is naturally extensible to the inference of classical signals coupled to quantum systems, a problem studied extensively in Refs. [13, 14, 34].

In that case, it must be emphasized that, although the quasi-probability functions can be used as an intermediate and often convenient step, the end result is always consistent with both logic and decision theory. The hybrid smoothing method is known to be optimal and superior to conventional prediction or filtering methods for certain quantum waveform estimation problems [35–38], analogous to the classical case [18, 39], whereas classical parameter estimation based on the weak-value approach often turns out to be suboptimal [40–43].

III. DISCRETE WIGNER REPRESENTATION OF QUBITS

Odd-dimensional systems possess a natural and unique definition of the discrete Wigner function [21, 22], but many equally qualified definitions can exist for even dimensions [44]. Here I consider the ones proposed by Feynman [45] and Wootters and co-workers [44, 46, 47]. Consider first a qubit, which can describe the path of a quantum particle in a two-arm interferometer, the polarization of a photon, or the spin of an electron for example. Define the observables of interest as

$$\hat{q} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(I - \sigma_Z\right), \quad \hat{p} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(I - \sigma_X\right), \quad \hat{r} \equiv \frac{1}{2}\left(I - \sigma_Y\right), \tag{3.1}$$

where σ_Z, σ_X, and σ_Y are Pauli matrices and I is the identity matrix. Define eigenstates of $\hat{q}$, $\hat{p}$, and $\hat{r}$ as $\hat{q}|0\rangle = 0|0\rangle$, $\hat{q}|1\rangle = |1\rangle$, $\hat{p}|+\rangle = 0|+\rangle$, $\hat{p}|-\rangle = |-\rangle$, $\hat{r}|i\rangle = 0|i\rangle$, and $\hat{r}|-i\rangle = |-i\rangle$. The discrete Wigner function proposed by Feynman [45] and Wootters [46] with respect to the eigenvalues of $\hat{q}$ and $\hat{p}$ is

$$\mathcal{W}_1\rho_x = \frac{1}{2}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A(q,p)\rho_x = W_1(q,p|x), \tag{3.2}$$

where

$$A(q,p) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(-1)^q\sigma_Z + (-1)^p\sigma_X + (-1)^{q+p}\sigma_Y + I\right]. \tag{3.3}$$

In the phase-space matrix format,

$$W_1(q,p|x) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} W_1(0,1|x) & W_1(1,1|x) \\ W_1(0,0|x) & W_1(1,0|x) \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.4}$$

For example,

$$\mathcal{W}_1|0\rangle\langle 0| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{W}_1|1\rangle\langle 1| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0.5 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.5}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_1|+\rangle\langle +| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad \mathcal{W}_1|-\rangle\langle -| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.6}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_1|i\rangle\langle i| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{W}_1|-i\rangle\langle -i| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.7}$$

These are plotted in Fig. 2. Note that the value of the $\hat{r}$ observable can also be inferred by defining

$$r = (q + p) \bmod 2. \tag{3.8}$$

Note also how the uncertainty relations among the three spin components are observed in phase space.



FIG. 2. A discrete Wigner representation of some qubit states.

For two qubits, one of the possible definitions of the Wigner functions proposed by Gibbons *et al.* [44, 47] is

$$\mathcal{W}_1\rho_x = \frac{1}{4}\,\mathrm{tr}\,A(q_1,q_2,p_1,p_2)\rho_x, \tag{3.9}$$

$$A(q_1,q_2,p_1,p_2) = \frac{1}{2}\left[(-1)^{q_1}\sigma_Z + (-1)^{p_1}\sigma_X + (-1)^{q+p_1}\sigma_Y + I\right] \otimes \frac{1}{2}\left[(-1)^{q_2}\sigma_Z + (-1)^{p_2}\sigma_X - (-1)^{q_2+p_2}\sigma_Y + I\right]. \tag{3.10}$$

Remarkably, the function stays non-negative for many separable states, as shown in Fig. 3, as well as some entangled states, as shown in Fig. 4. Unlike the case of odd dimensions, the correspondence between non-negative Wigner representations and the stabilizer model is not as strong for even dimensions [48, 49]. For two qubits,


$|0,0\rangle$ $|0,1\rangle$ $|1,0\rangle$ $|1,1\rangle$ $|+,+\rangle$ $|+,-\rangle$ $|-,+\rangle$ $|-,-\rangle$ $|i,i\rangle$ $|i,-i\rangle$ $|-i,i\rangle$ $|-i,-i\rangle$
$|0,+\rangle$ $|0,-\rangle$ $|1,+\rangle$ $|1,-\rangle$ $|0,i\rangle$ $|0,-i\rangle$ $|1,i\rangle$ $|1,-i\rangle$ $|+,0\rangle$ $|+,1\rangle$ $|-,0\rangle$ $|-,1\rangle$
$|+,i\rangle$ $|+,-i\rangle$ $|-,i\rangle$ $|-,-i\rangle$ $|i,0\rangle$ $|i,1\rangle$ $|-i,0\rangle$ $|-i,1\rangle$ $|i,+\rangle$ $|i,-\rangle$ $|-i,+\rangle$ $|-i,-\rangle$

FIG. 3. A discrete Wigner representation of separable two-qubit states. The non-zero elements are all equal to 1/4.

there are 60 pure stabilizer states [50], but the Wigner function considered here is non-negative for only 48 of them, as shown in Figs. 3 and 4, and becomes negative for the remaining 12.


$|00\rangle + |11\rangle$ $|00\rangle - |11\rangle$ $|01\rangle + |10\rangle$ $|01\rangle - |10\rangle$
$|00\rangle + |01\rangle + i|10\rangle - i|11\rangle$ $|00\rangle - |01\rangle + i|10\rangle + i|11\rangle$ $|00\rangle + |01\rangle - i|10\rangle + i|11\rangle$ $|00\rangle - |01\rangle - i|10\rangle - i|11\rangle$
$|00\rangle - i|01\rangle + |10\rangle + i|11\rangle$ $|00\rangle + i|01\rangle + |10\rangle - i|11\rangle$ $-|00\rangle + i|01\rangle + |10\rangle + i|11\rangle$ $|00\rangle + i|01\rangle - |10\rangle + i|11\rangle$

FIG. 4. A discrete Wigner representation of some entangled two-qubit states. Note that the states denoted in the titles are unnormalized for brevity.

For the measurement, the map on the POVM can be chosen as

$$\mathcal{W}_2 E(y|x) = N\mathcal{W}_1 E(y|x), \tag{3.11}$$

with N being the dimension, such that a fundamental property of the Wigner representation [44, 46] makes the hidden-variable model agree with Born's rule according to Eq. (2.5). Figs. 2, 3, and 4 then also depict the Wigner representations of projective measurements, normalization notwithstanding. Systems with initial states, state transitions, and measurements within this set of states with non-negative Wigner representations naturally permit logical smoothing inference.

IV. LOGICAL SMOOTHING AND COMPLEX WEAK VALUE

It is not difficult to construct examples where the weak value does not make sense, while the Wigner functions provide a logical path for smoothing inference. Consider an initial state given by

$$\rho_{x=0} = |0\rangle\langle 0|, \tag{4.1}$$
$$\rho_{x=1} = |1\rangle\langle 1|, \tag{4.2}$$
$$W_1(q,p|0) = \begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0 \\ 0.5 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.3}$$
$$W_1(q,p|1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0.5 \\ 0 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.4}$$

and a final $\hat{r}$ measurement given by

$$E(y=i) = |i\rangle\langle i|, \tag{4.5}$$
$$E(y=-i) = |-i\rangle\langle -i|, \tag{4.6}$$
$$W_2(i|q,p) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.7}$$
$$W_2(-i|q,p) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4.8}$$

W_1 and W_2 are consistent with Born's rule and remain non-negative for all x and y, enabling logical inference of the past values of q, p, and $r = (q + p) \bmod 2$. Suppose $x = 0$ and $y = i$. The smoothing quasi-probability function becomes

$$W(q, p|x = 0, y = i) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{4.9}$$

which infers with certainty that $q = p = r = 0$. This result concerning the three incompatible observables follows from a logical inference protocol but seems to be at odds with the uncertainty principle. The apparent conflict can be resolved by realizing that, under the quasi-probability framework, the uncertainty relation holds only for the predictive part W_1, and a smoothing inference can violate the principle even if it is logical. The weak value of $\hat{p}$, on the other hand, is

$$\frac{\langle i|\hat{p}|0\rangle}{\langle i|0\rangle} = \frac{1+i}{2}, \tag{4.10}$$

which is complex and makes no sense as an estimator. One could take the real part or the absolute value of the weak value to make it look more reasonable, but again there is no logical foundation that justifies such heuristic operations.

This example can also be studied using the approach of consistent histories [3]. The coherence functional is the central quantity in this approach and for the present example with $x = 0$ and $y = i$ is defined as $C(p, p')$ and given by

$$C(0,0) = \mathrm{tr}\,|i\rangle\langle i|+\rangle\langle +|0\rangle\langle 0|+\rangle\langle +|i\rangle\langle i| = \frac{1}{4}, \tag{4.11}$$

$$C(0,1) = \mathrm{tr}\,|i\rangle\langle i|+\rangle\langle +|0\rangle\langle 0|-\rangle\langle -|i\rangle\langle i| = -\frac{i}{4}, \tag{4.12}$$

$$C(1,0) = \mathrm{tr}\,|i\rangle\langle i|-\rangle\langle -|0\rangle\langle 0|+\rangle\langle +|i\rangle\langle i| = \frac{i}{4}, \tag{4.13}$$

$$C(1,1) = \mathrm{tr}\,|i\rangle\langle i|-\rangle\langle -|0\rangle\langle 0|-\rangle\langle -|i\rangle\langle i| = \frac{1}{4}. \tag{4.14}$$

Although the off-diagonal components $C(0,1)$ and $C(1,0)$ are not zero, they are imaginary and still satisfy the "weak consistency condition" defined in Ref. [3]. The general relation between the consistent histories approach and the quasi-probability approach here is an interesting open problem but beyond the scope of this paper.

V. THE AHARONOV-ALBERT-VAIDMAN GEDANKEN EXPERIMENT

To demonstrate the limitations of the quasi-probability approach, consider the original experiment proposed by AAV [5], as depicted in Fig. 5. A spin-1/2 particle is known to be in a pure state $|\psi\rangle$ at time t_1, A weak $\hat{q}$ measurement is then performed and can be modeled by



FIG. 5. A flowchart (quantum circuit diagram) depicting the Aharonov-Albert-Vaidman gedanken experiment. Starting with an initial state ψ, inference of the hidden variable λ at times t_1 and t_2 is performed using a weak q measurement with outcome δz and a final projective p measurement with outcome ξ.

the Kraus operator [26, 27]:

$$K(\delta z) = \frac{1}{(2\pi\delta t)^{1/4}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\delta z - \hat{q}\delta t)^2}{4\delta t}\right] \tag{5.1}$$

$$\approx \frac{1}{(2\pi\delta t)^{1/4}} \exp\left(-\frac{\delta z^2}{4\delta t}\right)\left(1 + \frac{\delta z}{2}\hat{q} - \frac{\delta t}{8}\hat{q}^2\right), \tag{5.2}$$

where δt characterizes the measurement strength, assumed to be unitless and $\ll 1$. The time after the weak measurement and before the final measurement is denoted as t_2. The final measurement is an p projection:

$$E(\xi = +) = |+\rangle\langle +|, \tag{5.3}$$

$$E(\xi = -) = |-\rangle\langle -|, \tag{5.4}$$

such that Born's rule is given by

$$P(\xi, \delta z|\psi) = \mathrm{tr}\,|\xi\rangle\langle\xi|K(\delta z)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|K^\dagger(\delta z). \tag{5.5}$$

It is important here not to confuse the measurement outcome δz with the hidden observable it is measuring. The weak-value approach calculates the average of $\delta z/\delta t$ for many trials and claims that it is an estimate of q, but such an approach cannot be justified unless it happens to agree with a Bayesian estimate. The approach would work for an analogous classical problem because there exists a likelihood function describing the weak measurement such that averaging the outcomes over many trials is akin to evaluating $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d(\delta z) P_2(\delta z|q)(\delta z/\delta t) = q$, which gives the true q. For the quantum problem, however, it is not obvious how such a non-negative likelihood function can be defined to justify the weak value as an estimate, unless the Kraus operator $K(\delta z)$ happens to commute with all the other operators in the problem.

Let's focus on the case $|\psi\rangle = |-\rangle$ with the final result $\xi = +$, which gives an infinite weak value [5]. The $\xi = +$ final result is possible because of the small backaction

noise introduced by the weak measurement to p. Consider the predictive Wigner functions $W_1(\lambda, t_1|\psi)$ and $W_1(\lambda, t_1|\psi, \delta z)$ before and after the weak measurement:

$$W_1(\lambda, t_1|-) \equiv \mathcal{W}_1|-\rangle\langle -| = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.6}$$

$$\begin{aligned} W_1(\lambda, t_2|-, \delta z) &\equiv \mathcal{W}_1 \frac{K(\delta z)|-\rangle\langle -|K^\dagger(\delta z)}{\mathrm{tr}(\text{numerator})} \\ &\propto \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\delta z}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 1.5 \\ -0.5 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta t}{8}\begin{pmatrix} -0.5 & -0.5 \\ 0.5 & 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

and the following retrodictive quasi-likelihood functions:

$$\begin{aligned} W_2(+, \delta z|\lambda, t_1) &\equiv \mathcal{W}_2 K^\dagger(\delta z)|+\rangle\langle +|K(\delta z) \\ &\propto \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{\delta z}{2}\begin{pmatrix} -0.5 & 0.5 \\ 0.5 & 1.5 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad + \frac{\delta t}{8}\begin{pmatrix} 0.5 & 0.5 \\ -0.5 & -0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

$$W_2(+|\lambda, t_2) \equiv \mathcal{W}_2|+\rangle\langle +| = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.9}$$

The smoothing quasi-probability functions $W(\lambda, t_{1,2}|\psi, \delta z, \xi)$ at times t_1 and t_2 are then

$$W(\lambda, t_1|-, \delta z, +) \approx \begin{pmatrix} 1/2 - 2\delta z/\delta t & 1/2 + 2\delta z/\delta t \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{5.10}$$

$$W(\lambda, t_2|-, \delta z, +) \approx \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1/2 - 2\delta z/\delta t & 1/2 + 2\delta z/\delta t \end{pmatrix}. \tag{5.11}$$

All the predictive, retrodictive, and smoothing quasi-probability functions are plotted in Fig. 6.

There are a few interesting observations to be made:

- Both $W_1(\lambda, t_2|-, \delta z)$ and $W_2(+, \delta z|\lambda, t_1)$ become negative when $\delta z \neq 0$, rendering the inference illogical. The smoothing quasi-probability functions still agree with common sense about p however, as they infer that p must be 1 at t_1 because of the initial state and 0 at t_2 because of the final measurement outcome.

- The marginal smoothing distributions with respect to q can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} W(q, t_1|-, \delta z, +) &\approx W(q, t_2|-, \delta z, +) \\ &\approx \left(\frac{1}{2} - 2\frac{\delta z}{\delta t} \quad \frac{1}{2} + 2\frac{\delta z}{\delta t}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{5.12}$$

  Even though the negativity of Wigner functions is limited, one sees here that the smoothing quasi-probabilities that result from them can have arbitrarily negative values if $|\delta z/\delta t| > 1/4$.



FIG. 6. The predictive (1st row), retrodictive (2nd row), and smoothing (3rd row) quasi-probability functions before and after the weak measurement for $\delta t = 0.1$ and $\delta z = \sqrt{0.1}$. Note that the $W_1(\lambda, t_2|-, \delta z)$, $W_2(+, \delta z|\lambda, t_1)$, and $W_2(+|\lambda, t_2)$ plotted here are unnormalized. All the functions must be non-negative for the inference to conform to logic; the negativity shown here is a signature of non-classicality.

- The MAP quasi-estimate of q is

$$q^{\mathrm{MAP}} = \begin{cases} 0, & \delta z < 0, \\ 1, & \delta z > 0, \\ \text{ambiguous}, & \delta z = 0. \end{cases} \tag{5.13}$$

  This makes sense, as the outcome δz of a q measurement, however noisy, should constitute evidence that should persuade the observer one way or the other. Because of the negative quasi-probabilities, the quasi-estimate should not be taken seriously as a logical estimator, but it is at least more sensible than the infinite weak value or, say, the naive conditional average:

$$\bar{q} \equiv \sum_q q W(q|-, \delta z, +) \approx \frac{1}{2} + 2\frac{\delta z}{\delta t}. \tag{5.14}$$

  $\bar{q}$ exceeds the range $[0, 1]$ when a smoothing quasi-probability becomes negative, that is, when $|\delta z/\delta t| > 1/4$. Since $\delta z \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and is typically

on the order of $\sqrt{\delta t}$, the magnitude of $\bar{q}$ can become extremely large, like the weak value. This anolamy is simply another manifestation of the illogicality that arises from the negative quasi-probabilities.

VI. OTHER RELATED WORK

The Bayesian inference of an intermediate quantum projective measurement outcome was first considered by Watanabe [51] and Aharonov, Bergmann, and Lebowitz [52]. Yanagisawa first introduced the term quantum smoothing and applied it to quantum non-demolition (QND) observables, which are compatible observables in the Heisenberg picture [53]. Refs. [13, 14, 34] focus on the smoothing inference of classical stochastic waveforms coupled to quantum systems under continuous measurements, while more recent papers by Dressel, Agarwal, and Jordan [54, 55] and Gammelmark, Julsgaard, and Mølmer [56] extend the theory to the inference of weak measurement outcomes. These results can be regarded as sharing the same foundation, as projective or weak measurement outcomes and classical random variables can all be modeled as QND observables in a suitably dilated Hilbert space [57]. A collection of QND observables that commute with each other at all times of interest are called a quantum-mechanics-free subsystem in Ref. [58] to emphasize that they have no quantum feature. It is easy to show that QND observables always have consistent histories [3].

The inference of QND observables is always compatible with decision theory, since they can be measured without any backaction and compared with the estimates for error evaluation, but the theory is not as general as the one proposed here and in Refs. [13, 14], as quasi-probability distributions generally involve incompatible observables. Another recent work by Chantasri, Dressel, and Jordan [59] also proposes a phase-space approach to the quantum smoothing problem, but their method is based on path integrals and its connection with more well known and useful quasi-probability functions is unclear.

VII. CONCLUSION

The Wigner representations are currently some of the best tools for finding classical models of quantum systems [17, 60], and negative Wigner quasi-probability is known to be a necessary resource for quantum computation [61–63]. By equating the logicality of quantum smoothing and the non-negativity of quasi-probability representations, I have also made a connection between the quantum smoothing inference problem and the notion of contextuality [19, 20]. These connections suggest that the smoothing method based on logical inference and Wigner functions is a pretty good, if not the best, attempt at reconciling logic and quantum mechanics when one tries to infer the past of a quantum system, and further progress along these lines will benefit multiple areas of quantum information processing and quantum foundations.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Inspiring and helpful discussions with Joshua Combes, Christopher Ferrie, Justin Dressel, and George Knee are gratefully acknowledged. This work is supported by the Singapore National Research Foundation under NRF Grant No. NRF-NRFF2011-07.

[1] John Archibald Wheeler, "The "past" and the "delayed-choice" double-slit experiment," in *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Theory*, edited by A. R. Marrow (Academic Press, New York, 1978) pp. 9–48.
[2] Asher Peres, "Time asymmetry in quantum mechanics: a retrodiction paradox," Physics Letters A **194**, 21–25 (1994).
[3] Robert B. Griffiths, *Consistent Quantum Theory* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).
[4] Yakir Aharonov and Daniel Rohrlich, *Quantum Paradoxes: Quantum Theory for the Perplexed* (Wiley, New York, 2005), and references therein.
[5] Yakir Aharonov, David Z. Albert, and Lev Vaidman, "How the result of a measurement of a component of the spin of a spin-1/2 particle can turn out to be 100," Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1351–1354 (1988).
[6] Yutaka Shikano, "Theory of "Weak Value" and Quantum Mechanical Measurements," in *Measurements in Quantum Mechanics*, edited by M. R. Pahlavani (InTech, 2012) Chap. 4, p. 75, and references therein.
[7] Adrian Cho, "Furtive approach rolls back the limits of quantum uncertainty," Science **333**, 690–693 (2011), and references therein.
[8] J. P. Groen, D. Ristè, L. Tornberg, J. Cramer, P. C. de Groot, T. Picot, G. Johansson, and L. DiCarlo, "Partial-measurement backaction and nonclassical weak values in a superconducting circuit," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 090506 (2013).
[9] L. Vaidman, "Past of a quantum particle," Phys. Rev. A **87**, 052104 (2013).
[10] A. Danan, D. Farfurnik, S. Bar-Ad, and L. Vaidman, "Asking photons where they have been," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 240402 (2013).
[11] P. Campagne-Ibarcq, L. Bretheau, E. Flurin, A. Auffèves, F. Mallet, and B. Huard, "Observing interferences between past and future quantum states in resonance fluorescence," ArXiv e-prints (2013), arXiv:1311.5605 [quant-ph].
[12] Christopher Ferrie and Joshua Combes, "How the result of a single coin toss can turn out to be 100 heads," ArXiv e-prints (2014), 1403.2362.

[13] Mankei Tsang, "Optimal waveform estimation for classical and quantum systems via time-symmetric smoothing," Phys. Rev. A **80**, 033840 (2009).

[14] Mankei Tsang, "Optimal waveform estimation for classical and quantum systems via time-symmetric smoothing. II. Applications to atomic magnetometry and Hardy's paradox," Phys. Rev. A **81**, 013824 (2010).

[15] Richard T. Cox, *The Algebra of Probable Inference* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1961).

[16] E. T. Jaynes, *Probability Theory: The Logic of Science*, edited by G. Larry Bretthorst (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).

[17] Christopher Ferrie, "Quasi-probability representations of quantum theory with applications to quantum information science," Reports on Progress in Physics **74**, 116001 (2011).

[18] Dan Simon, *Optimal State Estimation: Kalman, H Infinity, and Nonlinear Approaches* (Wiley, Hoboken, 2006).

[19] Christopher Ferrie and Joseph Emerson, "Frame representations of quantum mechanics and the necessity of negativity in quasi-probability representations," Journal of Physics A Mathematical General **41**, 352001 (2008), arXiv:0711.2658 [quant-ph].

[20] Robert W. Spekkens, "Negativity and contextuality are equivalent notions of nonclassicality," Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 020401 (2008).

[21] David Gross, "Hudson's theorem for finite-dimensional quantum systems," Journal of Mathematical Physics **47**, 122107 (2006), arXiv:quant-ph/0602001.

[22] David Gross, "Non-negative Wigner functions in prime dimensions," Applied Physics B: Lasers and Optics **86**, 367–370 (2007), quant-ph/0702004.

[23] M. Hillery, R. F. O'Connell, M. O. Scully, and E. P. Wigner, "Distribution functions in physics: Fundamentals," Phys. Rep. **106**, 121–167 (1984).

[24] Samuel L. Braunstein and Peter van Loock, "Quantum information with continuous variables," Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 513–577 (2005).

[25] Stephen D. Bartlett, Terry Rudolph, and Robert W. Spekkens, "Reconstruction of Gaussian quantum mechanics from Liouville mechanics with an epistemic restriction," Phys. Rev. A **86**, 012103 (2012).

[26] Karl Kraus, *States, Effects, and Operations: Fundamental Notions of Quantum Theory* (Springer, Berlin, 1983).

[27] Howard M. Wiseman and Gerard J. Milburn, *Quantum Measurement and Control* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).

[28] Lucien Hardy, "Quantum mechanics, local realistic theories, and lorentz-invariant realistic theories," Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2981–2984 (1992).

[29] Edward Brian Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic Press, London, 1976).

[30] Vladimir B. Braginsky and Farid Ya. Khalili, *Quantum Measurement* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992).

[31] Lars M. Johansen and Alfredo Luis, "Nonclassicality in weak measurements," Phys. Rev. A **70**, 052115 (2004).

[32] James O. Berger, *Statistical Decision Theory and Bayesian Analysis* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980).

[33] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).

[34] Mankei Tsang, "Time-symmetric quantum theory of smoothing," Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 250403 (2009).

[35] Mankei Tsang, Howard M. Wiseman, and Carlton M. Caves, "Fundamental quantum limit to waveform estimation," Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 090401 (2011).

[36] T. A. Wheatley, D. W. Berry, H. Yonezawa, D. Nakane, H. Arao, D. T. Pope, T. C. Ralph, H. M. Wiseman, A. Furusawa, and E. H. Huntington, "Adaptive optical phase estimation using time-symmetric quantum smoothing," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 093601 (2010).

[37] Hidehiro Yonezawa, Daisuke Nakane, Trevor A. Wheatley, Kohjiro Iwasawa, Shuntaro Takeda, Hajime Arao, Kentaro Ohki, Koji Tsumura, Dominic W. Berry, Timothy C. Ralph, Howard M. Wiseman, Elanor H. Huntington, and Akira Furusawa, "Quantum-enhanced optical-phase tracking," Science **337**, 1514–1517 (2012).

[38] Kohjiro Iwasawa, Kenzo Makino, Hidehiro Yonezawa, Mankei Tsang, Aleksandar Davidovic, Elanor Huntington, and Akira Furusawa, "Quantum-limited mirror-motion estimation," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 163602 (2013).

[39] Harry L. Van Trees, *Detection, Estimation, and Modulation Theory, Part I.* (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2001).

[40] George C. Knee, G. Andrew D. Briggs, Simon C. Benjamin, and Erik M. Gauger, "Quantum sensors based on weak-value amplification cannot overcome decoherence," Phys. Rev. A **87**, 012115 (2013).

[41] George C. Knee and Erik M. Gauger, "When amplification with weak values fails to suppress technical noise," Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011032 (2014).

[42] Saki Tanaka and Naoki Yamamoto, "Information amplification via postselection: A parameter-estimation perspective," Phys. Rev. A **88**, 042116 (2013).

[43] Christopher Ferrie and Joshua Combes, "Weak value amplification is suboptimal for estimation and detection," Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 040406 (2014).

[44] Kathleen S. Gibbons, Matthew J. Hoffman, and William K. Wootters, "Discrete phase space based on finite fields," Phys. Rev. A **70**, 062101 (2004).

[45] Richard P. Feynman, "Negative probability," in *Quantum Implications: Essays in Honour of David Bohm*, edited by F. David Peat and Basil Hiley (Routledge, London, 1987) pp. 235–248.

[46] William K. Wootters, "A Wigner-function formulation of finite-state quantum mechanics," Annals of Physics **176**, 1 – 21 (1987).

[47] William K. Wootters, "Picturing Qubits in Phase Space," eprint arXiv:quant-ph/0306135 (2003), quant-ph/0306135.

[48] Ernesto F. Galvão, "Discrete Wigner functions and quantum computational speedup," Phys. Rev. A **71**, 042302 (2005).

[49] Cecilia Cormick, Ernesto F. Galvão, Daniel Gottesman, Juan Pablo Paz, and Arthur O. Pittenger, "Classicality in discrete Wigner functions," Phys. Rev. A **73**, 012301 (2006).

[50] Scott Aaronson and Daniel Gottesman, "Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits," Phys. Rev. A **70**, 052328 (2004).

[51] Satosi Watanabe, "Symmetry of physical laws. part III. prediction and retrodiction," Rev. Mod. Phys. **27**, 179–186 (1955).

[52] Yakir Aharonov, Peter G. Bergmann, and Joel L. Lebowitz, "Time symmetry in the quantum process of measurement," Phys. Rev. **134**, B1410–B1416 (1964).

[53] M. Yanagisawa, "Quantum smoothing," ArXiv e-prints (2007), arXiv:0711.3885 [quant-ph].

[54] J. Dressel, S. Agarwal, and A. N. Jordan, "Contextual values of observables in quantum measurements," Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 240401 (2010).

[55] J. Dressel and A. N. Jordan, "Contextual-value approach to the generalized measurement of observables," Phys. Rev. A **85**, 022123 (2012).

[56] Søren Gammelmark, Brian Julsgaard, and Klaus Mølmer, "Past quantum states of a monitored system," Phys. Rev. Lett. **111**, 160401 (2013).

[57] Viacheslav P. Belavkin, "Nondemolition principle of quantum measurement theory," Foundations of Physics **24**, 685–714 (1994).

[58] Mankei Tsang and Carlton M. Caves, "Evading quantum mechanics: Engineering a classical subsystem within a quantum environment," Phys. Rev. X **2**, 031016 (2012).

[59] A. Chantasri, J. Dressel, and A. N. Jordan, "Action principle for continuous quantum measurement," Phys. Rev. A **88**, 042110 (2013).

[60] Mankei Tsang, "Testing quantum mechanics: a statistical approach," Quantum Measurements and Quantum Metrology **1**, 84–109 (2013).

[61] Victor Veitch, Christopher Ferrie, David Gross, and Joseph Emerson, "Negative quasi-probability as a resource for quantum computation," New Journal of Physics **14**, 113011 (2012), arXiv:1201.1256 [quant-ph].

[62] Victor Veitch, Seyed Ali Hamed Mousavian, Daniel Gottesman, and Joseph Emerson, "The Resource Theory of Stabilizer Computation," ArXiv e-prints (2013), arXiv:1307.7171 [quant-ph].

[63] A. Mari and J. Eisert, "Positive wigner functions render classical simulation of quantum computation efficient," Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 230503 (2012).